

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are presented for further examination. Claims 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 18, and 21 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled.

In the final Office Action mailed June 28, 2006, the Examiner objected to claims 7, 8, and 15 because of informalities. Claims 12-14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite because claims 12-14 lacked antecedent basis for suggesting a plurality of modes of operation inasmuch as claim 11 suggested only a single mode of operation. In addition, it was unclear in claim 18 whether the recited first and second distances were the same as the first and second distances in claim 15. Claims 6-10, 15, and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Miyamoto (of record). Claim 16 was rejected as obvious over Miyamoto in view of Iiyama et al. Claims 11-14 were rejected as obvious over Vercelotti et al. in view of Miyamoto. Claims 1-5 were allowed and claims 7, 8, and 15 were found to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections and rejections under Section 112.

Applicants respectfully request reexamination of the claims.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 6 has been amended to consistently refer to the passive and active “state” instead of to the previously stricken word “mode” and to include the limitation of allowable dependent claim 7.

Claim 7 has been canceled.

Claim 8 has been amended to use the definite article “the” for features previously recited in independent claim 8 instead of using the indefinite articles “a” or “an” and vice versa and to distinguish operation of the circuits.

Dependent claim 10 has changed “transponder” to “tag” to conform to the language of claim 8.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to indicate that it is the architecture as structured that performs the modes of operation and not the CMOS controller as previously recited and to distinguish operation of the circuits.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to use the appropriate definite and indefinite articles and to correct the reference to the source of the radio frequency signal to be the "transceiver" and to distinguish operation of the circuits.

Claim 18 has been amended to use the definite article "the" in reference to the first and second distances.

Dependent claim 21 has been amended to correctly refer to the previously recited microcontroller circuit.

### Conclusion

No new matter has been added by the foregoing amendments. All of the amendments to the claims have been made to correct informalities and to include allowable subject matter in all rejected independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that all claims remaining in this application are now in condition for allowance.

In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



E. Russell Tarleton

Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jl

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300  
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

130105.415 / 826731\_1.DOC